

### **Remarks**

This Amendment and Response is considered fully responsive to the 26 June 2009 Non-Final Office Action. Claims 1-7, 12-33 and 38-52 were pending in the application. Claims 1-7, 12-33 and 38-52 stand rejected in the 26 June 2009 Non-Final Office Action. In the following Response, claims 1, 3, 27, 29 and 50 are amended, claims 15, 18, 19, 40, 42 and 43 are canceled and claims 53-55 are added. Support for new claims 53-55 can be found throughout the Specification and Figures (e.g., paragraph [0035] and FIG. 1). No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments. Claims 1-7, 12-33 and 38-55 are now pending in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration are requested.

### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103, Sheu in view of Justice**

The Non-Final Office Action has rejected claims 17, 20, 21, 44, 51 and 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being purportedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,099,301 to Sheu (hereinafter “Sheu”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,516,056 to Justice (hereinafter “Justice”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 51, from which claims 17, 20, and 21 depend, recites that information associated with a communication is recorded at a call mediator and that the information associated with the communication recorded at the call mediator is parsed to create an authentication record. (emphasis added)

Claim 52, from which claim 44 depends, similarly recites a call mediator that records information associated with a communication and an enterprise gateway that is programmed to create an authentication record by parsing the information associated with the communication. (emphasis added)

The Justice reference discloses a customer service center that includes a database 40. The database 40 typically includes a variety of interrelated database records corresponding to transactions processed by the customer service center. The database 40 contains customer account records (including a telephone number) and information on an order history related to each customer account. *See* column 4, line 24-52. A database record for a new customer is created by a customer service representative (CSR) that requests and receives information from a

customer, enters the information into an order entry program, and saves the information in the database 40. *See* column 8, lines 10-18.

The Examiner argues that the Justice reference discloses “information associated with [a] phone number is used to create an authentication record” referring to Figure 11 of the Justice reference. *See* paragraph 1 on page 13 of the Office Action. Applicant respectfully points out that this is different from what is recited in claims 51 and 52.

First, claim 51 recites that the information associated with the communication that is recorded at a call mediator is parsed to create an authentication record. (emphasis added) Claim 52 has similar limitations. The database record disclosed in the Justice reference, however, includes a telephone number that is not related to a communication, but rather is information related to a customer.

Second, the Justice reference discloses a database 40 that is created by a customer service representative. The information in the customer information screen 350 shown in Figure 11 of the Justice reference is created by a customer service representative (CSR) and not by parsing information associated with a communication recorded at a call mediator.

Even if one were to combine the Justice reference with the Sheu reference (which Applicant maintains would be improper), the combination proposed by the Examiner fails to disclose at least these limitations recited in claims 51 and 52 and their dependent claims. Thus, claims 17, 20, 21, 44, 51 and 52 are not obvious over the Sheu reference in view of the Justice reference. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 17, 20, 21, 44, 51 and 52 and allow claims 17, 20, 21, 44, 51 and 52. Furthermore, claims 16 and 41 are allowable by virtue of their dependency from claims 51 and 52, respectively.

As independent claims 1, 27 and 50 contain the same or similar limitations as claims 51 and 52, these claims are also in a condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 51 and 52.

Similarly, as claims 2-7, 12-14 and 22-26 depend from allowable claim 1, and claims 28-33, 38, 39 and 45-49 depend from claim allowable claim 27, these claims are also in a condition for allowance by virtue of their dependencies therefrom. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully

requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-7, 12-14, 16, 22-33, 38, 39, 41 and 45-50 and allow these claims.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103, Sheu in view of Kneipp and Meisel**

The Non-Final Office Action has rejected, *inter alia*, claims 3 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being purportedly unpatentable over Sheu in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,102,970 to Kneipp (hereinafter “Kneipp”) and U.S. Patent No. 7,197,640 to Meisel (hereinafter “Meisel”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 3 recites that the recording information associated with the communication comprises recording a network identifier associated with a network endpoint, wherein the network identifier specifies an enterprise customer network in which the network endpoint resides. (emphasis added) Claim 29 contains the same or similar limitations as claim 3.

The cited passage in the Sheu reference used to reject claim 3 discloses that “[o]nce the terminal 150 is logged on and registered with the terminal device directory service 180, the VoIP proxy gateway 160 can obtain the IP address of the terminal 150 and provide it to the designated gateway 130.” See column 7, lines 1-5. Note that Sheu does not disclose an identifier of an enterprise customer network in which the network endpoint (i.e., terminal) resides. Instead, Sheu merely discloses that the identifier (i.e., IP address) of the terminal 150 itself is provided to the designated gateway 130. Thus, the Sheu reference does not teach or suggest the limitation that the network identifier specifies an enterprise customer network in which the network endpoint resides..

Even if one were to combine the Kneipp and Meisel references with the Sheu reference (which Applicant maintains would be improper), the combination proposed by the Examiner fails to disclose at least these limitations recited in claims 3 and 29. Thus, in addition to the reasons previously discussed, claims 3 and 29 are not obvious over the Sheu reference in view of the Kneipp and Meisel references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 3 and 29 and allow claims 3 and 29. Similarly, as new claims 53-55 contain the same or similar limitations as allowable claims 3 and 29, these claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons.

### Conclusion

Claims 1-7, 12-33 and 38-55 are currently pending in the application. Applicant believes that claims 1-7, 12-33 and 38-55 are in a condition for allowance. Applicant therefore requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

If the Examiner should require any additional information or believes any issues could be resolved via a telephone interview, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

December 21, 2009

/JCS/

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jonathan C. Siekmann, Reg. No. 58,259  
USPTO Customer No. 83579

Level 3 Communications, LLC  
1025 Eldorado Blvd.  
Broomfield, Colorado 80021  
Tel: 720-888-2140  
Fax: 720-888-5619